Synchronization of Pulse-Coupled Oscillators and Clocks under Minimal Connectivity Assumptions

Anton Proskurnikov, *Member, IEEE*, Ming Cao, *Member, IEEE*

arXiv:1510.02338v1 [cs.SY] 8 Oct 2015

***Abstract*—Populations of flashing fireflies, claps of applauding audience, cells of cardiac and circadian pacemakers reach synchrony via event-triggered interactions, referred to as *pulse couplings*. Synchronization via pulse coupling is widely used in wireless sensor networks, providing clock synchronization with parsimonious packet exchanges. In spite of serious attention paid to networks of pulse coupled oscillators, there is a lack of mathematical results, addressing networks with general communication topologies and phase-response curves. The most general results of this type (Wang et al., 2012, 2015) establish synchronization of oscillators with a delay-advance phase-response curve over strongly connected networks. In this paper we extend this result by relaxing the connectivity condition to the existence of a directed spanning tree (rootedness), both necessary and sufficient for synchronization. Furthermore, we prove synchronization under *repeatedly* rooted switching topologies, given that the dwell time between consecutive switches exceeds the oscillators' period.**

***Index Terms*—Pulse coupled oscillators, networks, synchronization, event-triggered control**

I. Introduction

Recent progress in electronics opened up the possibility of large scale control systems, where sensors, processors and actuators are spatially distributed over large areas and have to use energy-supply and communication resources "parsimoniously" [2]. This gave rise to a number of rapidly growing fields in control theory such as control with limited data-rates (see e.g. [3] and references therein) and event-triggered control [4]–[7].

Many control and coordination algorithms, facing communication and computational constraints, were originally inspired by nature; some of them were discovered in natural sciences long before the "boom" in networked control. Early studies of the phenomenon of synchronous flashing in large populations of male fireflies in the dark [8], [9] disclosed a vision-based distributed protocol, allowing the biological agents to synchronize their "clocks". A single flash (that is, an *event*, fired by an agent) initiated almost instantaneous flashes of nearby fireflies, and *"each individual apparently took his cue to flash from his more immediate neighbors, so that the mass flash took the form of a very rapid chain of overlapping flashes..."* [9, p. 310]. In a similar way the claps of many hands synchronize into rhythmic applause [10]. Later works revealed the role of such event-based interactions, referred to as the *pulse coupling*, in synchronization of other biological networks, including cardiac pacemakers [11] and circadian clocks [12], [13]. Self-synchronizing networks of biological pulse-coupled oscillators (PCO) inspired efficient algorithms for *clock synchronization* in wireless sensor networks [14]–[18], dramatically reducing the message exchange between the sensors and increasing the network reliability.

The influential papers [19], [20], addressing the dynamics of PCO networks, attracted extensive attention from applied mathematicians, physicists and engineers, since ensembles of PCO give an instructive model of self-organization in complex systems, composed of very simple units. Mathematically, each unit of the ensemble has a scalar state, called *phase*, and is itself a dynamical system (e.g. the "integrate-and-fire" neuron [19]), operating in the vicinity of a stable limit cycle. An oscillator's phase varies in a bounded interval; upon achieving its maximum, the phase is reset to the minimal value. At this time the oscillator fires an event, e.g. emitting electric pulse or other stimulus. The length of this pulse is very short compared to the natural period of the oscillator. In other words, unlike Kuramoto networks and other *diffusively* coupled oscillator ensembles [21], the interactions of PCO are instantaneous and event-triggered. The effect of a stimulus from a neighboring oscillator on an oscillator's trajectory is modeled by a *phase shift*, which is characterized by a nonlinear map, called the *phase response curve* (PRC) [22].

In spite of significant interest to synchronization in pulse-coupled networks, the mathematical results are mostly limited to networks with either "weak" couplings or special topologies. Under weak coupling PCO networkss can be approximated by a continuous-time Kuramoto model [16], [18], [20], [23], [24], which is now well studied (see e.g. [21], [25] and references therein); analogous arguments are applicable to infinite systems of oscillators [26], [27]. Analysis of general hybrid dynamics is confined to networks with all-to-all or cyclic couplings [19], [28]–[30], providing some fixed order of oscillators' firing.

Nevertheless, for an important class of PCO networks, where PRC maps are of the *delay-advance* type [31], a few results on synchronization of identical PCO over general interaction graphs have recently been obtained [17], [32]. Assuming the topology to be *strongly connected* and PRC map to be delay-advanced and piecewise-linear [32] or at least linear near the endpoints of the phase interval [17], it was shown that any ensemble of PCO reaches synchrony asymptotically [32] or (under extra assumptions) even in finite

Anton V. Proskurnikov is with the ENTEG institute at the University of Groningen, The Netherlands, and also with St. Petersburg State University, Institute for Problems of Mechanical Engineering RAS and ITMO University, St. Petersburg, Russia, e-mail: av1982@gmail.com

Ming Cao is with the ENTEG institute at the University of Groningen, The Netherlands, e-mail: ming.cao@ieee.org.

The results were partly reported [1] on the First International Conference on Event-Based Control, Communication and Signal Processing (EBCCSP 2015), Krakow, 17-19 June 2015.

time [17], if the deviations between the initial phases are less than one half of the oscillators' period.

The main idea of the proof in [17], [32] is the *contracting property* of the network dynamics under the assumption of delay-advance PRC, enabling one to use the maximal distance between the oscillators ("diameter" of the ensemble) as a Lyapunov function; this approach is commonly used in multi-agent consensus problems [33]–[35]. In the present paper we further develop this approach and extend the results from [17], [32], addressing protocols with general *nonlinear* delay-advance PRC maps and relaxing the key assumption of the strong connectivity to *rootedness* (i.e. existence of a directed spanning tree), which, like in consensus theory, is also necessary for synchronization. Both extensions are of importance. Dealing with biological PCO, the interaction graph is usually "densely" connected (so the strong connectivity assumption is not very restrictive), but the linearity of PRC maps is an impractical condition. On the other hand, dealing with synchronization of networked clocks, the piecewise-linear PRC map is quite natural (and is optimal in some sense [16], [18]), but one is often interested in optimization of the communication graph, e.g. in finding the *minimal* connectivity assumptions under which synchronization is possible.

The similarity between the networks of PCO with delay-advance PRC maps and first-order consensus protocols, discussed in [32], gives rise to a question: does the synchronization criterion remain valid, relaxing the rootedness assumption to the *repeated* rootedness (referred also to as the *uniform quasi-strong connectivity*, UQSC [34], [35]), where the topology can evolve over time, remaining piecewise constant with a positive dwell time between two consecutive switches, and guaranteeing any union of the graphs over some fixed period is rooted. We prove synchronization under repeated rootedness, assuming the dwell time to exceed the oscillator's natural period. We show that, unlike consensus protocols [33]–[35], for PCO networks the repeated rootedness is *not* sufficient for synchronization, if the dwell time is strictly less than the oscillator's natural period. The case when the "critical" dwell-time equals to the natural period remains an open problem except for periodically switching graphs and special PRC [17].

The results concerned with static interaction topologies were partly reported in the conference paper [1]. Unlike [1], we not only give detailed proofs but also extend our results to time-varying interaction graphs.

The paper is organized as follows. Section II introduces some technical concepts and notation. The PCO network in question is introduced in Section III. Main results are formulated in Section IV, illustrated in Section V by numerical simulations and proved in Section VI.

II. Preliminaries and notation

Given $t_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ and a function $f(\cdot)$, defined at least on the interval $(t_0-\varepsilon_0; t_0)$ for $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ sufficiently small, let $f(t_0-) \triangleq \lim\limits_{t\to t_0, t<t_0} f(t)$. Similarly, if f is well defined $(t_0; t_0+\varepsilon_0)$, we denote $f(t_0+) \triangleq \lim\limits_{t\to t_0, t>t_0} f(t)$. The function is *left-continuous* at t_0, if $f(t_0-) = f(t_0)$ and *right-continuous*, if $f(t_0+) = f(t_0)$. A function $f : [0; +\infty) \to \mathbb{R}$ is *piecewise continuous*, if it is continuous at any point $t \geq 0$, except for a sequence $\{t_k\}$ without accumulation points, along which one-side limits $f(t_k\pm)$ exist (the limit $f(0+)$ also should exist).

We denote the unit circle on the complex plane by $\mathbb{S}^1 = \{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z| = 1\}$. Given $\varphi \in \mathbb{R}$, $e^{\imath\varphi} = \cos\varphi + \imath \sin\varphi \in \mathbb{S}^1$.

A (directed) *graph* is a pair (V, E), where V and $E \subseteq V \times V$ are finite sets, whose elements are referred to as the *nodes* and *arcs* respectively. An arc $e = (v, v')$ is said to *connect* v to v'. A *walk* in the graph is sequence of nodes $v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_k$, where consequent nodes are connected by arcs $(v_i, v_{i+1}) \in E$. A *root* is a node, from where walks to all other nodes exist. A graph having a root is called *rooted* (this is equivalent to existence of a *directed spanning tree* [36]); a graph in which any node is a root is called *strongly connected*.

III. The problem setup

We deal with a network of N identical oscillators, whose hybrid free-run dynamics are

$$\dot\theta_j(t) = \omega \text{ when } \theta_i(t) < 2\pi;\ \theta_j(t) = 2\pi \Rightarrow \theta_j(t+) = 0. \quad (1)$$

Here $\theta_j(t) \in [0; 2\pi]$ is the left-continuous *phase*[1] of the jth oscillator and $\omega > 0$ is its constant *natural frequency*. As the phase reaches the maximum 2π, it is reset to 0. At this time the oscillator fires an *event*, e.g. by sending out a stimulus, received by some (possibly, all) of the remaining oscillators. Their dynamics are influenced by this event as follows[2]

$$\theta_i(t+) = \theta_i(t) + c a_{ij}(t)\Phi(\theta_i(t)) \mod 2\pi \ \forall i \neq j. \quad (2)$$

The functions $a_{ij}(t) \in \{0; 1\}$ are assumed to be *piecewise-continuous* and determine the communication topology of the network: the event initiated by the jth oscillator at time t influences the ith one if and only if $a_{ij}(t) = 1$; otherwise, $\theta_i(t+) = \theta_i(t)$ so that the ith oscillator continues its free run. The map $\Phi : [0; 2\pi] \to \mathbb{R}$ is called the *phase response curve* (PRC); it describes the phase-dependent phase shift upon receiving a stimulus. Finally, $c > 0$ is the *coupling strength*. The dynamics of oscillators, affected by the stimulus (such as $a_{ij}(t) = 1$) can be alternatively rewritten as

$$\theta_i(t+) = \Psi(\theta_i(t)) \mod 2\pi, \quad \Psi(\theta) \triangleq \theta + c\Phi(\theta). \quad (3)$$

The map $\Psi(\theta)$ is called the *phase transition curve* (PTC).

In natural networks of PCO each oscillator is usually governed by a high-order system of differential equations [28]. Equation (1) describes only the motion along the stable limit cycle, neglecting the *transversal* dynamics. This transversal dynamics of the oscillator and the shape of its neighbor's stimulus determine the PRC mapping Φ, which can be found analytically or experimentally [22], [28], [37]–[39]. The coupling gain $c > 0$ characterizes the intensities of the emitted stimuli. The PTC map Ψ depends thus on all of these factors.

In order to make the model just described complete, it remains to define the behavior when several oscillators fire

[1] Usually the values 0 and 2π are "glued" together, however it is convenient to allow $\theta_j(t) = 2\pi$, assuming that $\theta_j(t) = \theta_j(t-)$ at any point $t > 0$.

[2] Unlike [17], in this paper we confine ourselves to oscillators without *refractory periods*, i.e. "dead zones" in which oscillators remain unaffected.



Fig. 1: An example of delay-advance PRC map


$\theta_i(t) \in (0;\pi) \Longrightarrow 0 < \theta_i(t+) < \theta_i(t)$
$\theta_j(t) = 2\pi$ (the jth clock is **firing**)
$\theta_k(t) \in (\pi;2\pi) \Longrightarrow \theta_k(t) < \theta_k(t+) < 2\pi$

Fig. 2: Illustration to Assumptions 1 and 2

simultaneously (a "cluster burst" [29] occurs).We follow the model from [29] and consider the resulting phase jump as the (nonlinear) *superposition* of several jumps. Hence, if the ith oscillator is affected at time t by k simultaneously firing oscillators, then its phase is reset to

$$\theta_i(t+) = \underbrace{\Psi \circ \Psi \circ \ldots \circ \Psi}_{k \text{ times}}(\theta_i(t)) \mod 2\pi, \qquad (4)$$

which can also be considered as k instantaneous jumps (2).

It should be noted that the superposed effect of several events (4) is often replaced by *additive one* [20]

$$\theta_i(t+) = \theta_i(t) + c \sum_{j:\theta_j(t)=2\pi} a_{ij}\Phi(\theta_i(t)) \mod 2\pi, \qquad (5)$$

under which, however, the trajectories are generally *discontinuous* with respect to the initial conditions. Such a protocol is usually investigated for *weak coupling* ($c \approx 0$), where the hybrid dynamics (1),(5) is reduced to the Kuramoto model [16], [18], [20]. Another approach, embedding the PCO network into a very general class of hybrid systems [40], allows *multi-valued* transitions under several simultaneous events [30], [32].

Our goal is to find out conditions which guarantee asymptotic synchronization in the networked system (1),(2),(4).

Definition 1: The phases $\theta_i(\cdot)$ ($i \in 1:N$) synchronize if

$$e^{\imath(\theta_i(t)-\theta_j(t))} \xrightarrow[t\to\infty]{} 1 \Longleftrightarrow e^{\imath\theta_i(t)} - e^{\imath\theta_j(t)} \xrightarrow[t\to\infty]{} 0. \qquad (6)$$

The exponential function in Definition 1 is caused by necessity to neglect the jumps in the deviations $\theta_i(t) - \theta_j(t)$ when some oscillators are reset ($\theta_i = 2\pi$); unlike the case of continuous phases [21], generally $\theta_i(t) - \theta_j(t) \not\to 0$ as $t \to \infty$.

In this paper, we confine ourselves to analysis of oscillators with *delay-advanced* PRC maps [17], which implies that $\Phi(\theta) < 0$ as $\theta \in (0;\pi)$ and $\Phi(\theta) > 0$ as $\theta \in (\pi;2\pi)$ and $\Phi(0) = \Phi(2\pi) = 0$. Note that $\Phi(\theta)$ can be discontinuous at $\theta = \pi$ like e.g. the piecewise-linear PRC map considered in [16], [18], [30], [32] (see Fig. 1)

$$\Phi(\theta) = \begin{cases} -\theta, & \theta \in [0;\pi) \\ 2\pi - \theta, & \theta \in (\pi;2\pi] \\ \text{any}, & \theta = \pi. \end{cases} \qquad (7)$$

The delay-advance assumption also holds for some important models of oscillators (e.g. *isochronous clocks* [28]). For $c > 0$ sufficiently small it implies, as will be shown, that the phase jump (2) decreases the distance $|e^{\imath\theta_i(t)} - e^{\imath\theta_j(t)}|$.

It is commonly known that even under all-to-all interactions the oscillators generally do not synchronize and the clustering behavior is possible [19], [26], [28], [29]. The simplest example is a pair ($N = 2$) of coupled oscillators, where a_{12}, a_{21} are constant and the PRC satisfies $\Phi(0) = \Phi(\pi) = \Phi(2\pi) = 0$. Then the solution, starting at $(\theta_1(0), \theta_2(0)) = (0;\pi)$, is periodic and does not reach synchrony.

In this paper we assume, following [17], [32], that initial phases $\theta_i(0)$ differ by less than π. Synchronization of identical Kuramoto oscillators under such initial conditions is a well known fact [25], [41]; however, synchronization under the protocol (1),(2) is proved only under the assumption of *strong connectivity* and special PRC maps. In the next section we show that in the case of static graph ($a_{ij} = const$) synchronization is achieved if and only if the graph is *rooted*. We also consider the case of switching topology, where the latter assumption can be relaxed to repeated rootedness, provided that the dwell-time between switches is sufficiently large.

IV. Main results

We start with the main assumptions, concerned with the PRC map $\Phi(\cdot)$, the coupling strength and the initial conditions.

A. Assumptions

Our first assumption requires $\Phi(\cdot)$ to be *delay-advance* [17].

Assumption 1: The function $\Phi : [0;2\pi] \to \mathbb{R}$ is continuous on $[0;\pi)$ and $(\pi;2\pi)$ with $\Phi(0) = \Phi(2\pi) = 0$. Furthermore, $\Phi(\theta) < 0$ if $\theta \in (0;\pi)$ and $\Phi(\theta) > 0$ when $\theta \in (\pi;2\pi)$.

In other words, if the jth oscillator fires ($\theta_j(t) = 2\pi$) and $\theta_i(t) \in (0;\pi)$, then the ith "clock" is ahead of the jth one and to be *delayed*. If $\theta_k(t) \in (\pi;2\pi)$ then the kth "clock" is behind the jth one and to be *advanced* (see Fig. 2).

The following additional assumption guarantees such delay or advance operations do not lead to "overshoots" (the "delaying" oscillators do not become "advancing" and vice versa); in particular, the jumps (2) decrease the distance $|e^{\imath\theta_j} - e^{\imath\theta_i}|$.

Assumption 2: The PTC mapping $\Psi(\cdot)$ from (3) satisfies

$$\Psi(\theta) > 0 \ \forall\theta \in (0;\pi), \quad \Psi(\theta) < 2\pi \ \forall\theta \in (\pi;2\pi). \qquad (8)$$

Analogous *no-overrun* conditions are often adopted in the literature, see e.g. [29]. Note that the strict inequalities in (8) automatically prohibit finite-time synchronization, addressed in [17]. On the other hand, such a synchronization is possible only in a special case where $\Psi(\theta) = \theta + c\Phi(\theta) \equiv 2\pi$ as $\theta \approx 2\pi$ [17], which is non-robust in the coupling gain c and usually fails for nonlinear PRC maps. On the other hand, conditions



Fig. 3: $Z = \{z_1, z_2, z_3\}$, $d(Z) = 5\pi/4$

(8) always hold for $c > 0$ being small provided that

$$\inf_{\theta\in(0;\pi)} \frac{\Phi(\theta)}{\theta} > -\infty, \quad \sup_{\theta\in(\pi;2\pi)} \frac{\Phi(\theta)}{2\pi-\theta} < \infty.$$

This makes our result applicable not only to wireless sensor networks but also to some models of natural oscillators [28].

To formulate our last assumption, concerning the initial conditions, we need an additional definition.

Definition 2: We call a closed connected subset $L \subseteq \mathbb{S}^1$ (that is, a set $L = \{e^{\imath\omega} : \omega \in [a;b], 0 \le b-a \le 2\pi\}$) an *arc* in $\mathbb{S}^1$ and denote its length (in radians) with $|L| = b-a$. Given a finite set $Z = \{z_i\}_{i=1}^N \subset \mathbb{S}^1$, we define its *diameter* $d(Z)$ as the minimal length of arcs, containing Z: $d(Z) \triangleq \min_{Z\subset L} |L| \in [0;2\pi)$. Finally, given a sequence $\bar\theta = \{\theta_i\}_{i=1}^N \subset [0;2\pi]$, we define its diameter as $d(\bar\theta) \triangleq d(\{e^{\imath\theta_1}, \dots, e^{\imath\theta_N}\})$.

Definition 2 is illustrated by Fig. 3: one has $d(Z) = 5\pi/4$, and one of the two minimal arcs is drawn in red. It is obvious that synchronization (6) means that $d(\bar\theta(t)) \to 0$ as $t \to \infty$.

Assumption 3: One has $d(\theta_1(0), \dots, \theta_N(0)) < \pi$; in particular, the minimal arc L_0 containing points $e^{\imath\theta_j(0)}$ is unique.

Assumption 1-3 imply that solutions of the system (1),(2),(4) are prolongable up to ∞ and Zeno behavior is not possible. Moreover, the "dwell-time" between consequent events of the same oscillator is greater than one half of the oscillator's period.

Theorem 1: Suppose that Assumptions 1-3 hold and let $T = 2\pi/\omega$ be the natural period of PCOs. Then for any functions $a_{ij} : [0;\infty) \to \{0;1\}$ the following claims are valid:

1) the left-continuous solution $\bar\theta(t) = \{\theta_j(t)\}_{j=1}^N$ exists, and is unique and prolongable up to ∞;
2) the diameter $d(\bar\theta(t)) = |L(\bar\theta(t))|$ is non-increasing, in particular, $d(\bar\theta(t)) \le d(\bar\theta(0)) < \pi$ for any $t \ge 0$;
3) let $L(t) = L(\bar\theta(t))$ be the arc of minimal length, containing $\{e^{\imath\theta_j(t)}\}_{j=1}^N$, then $L(t+s) \subseteq e^{\imath\omega s} L(t)\, \forall t, s \ge 0$;
4) if t' and t'' are two consecutive instants when the same oscillator fires, then $T/2 < t'' - t' \le T$, and during the interval $[t';t'')$ all the remaining oscillators fire.

Notice that Theorem 1, to be proved in Section VI, makes no assumption about the interaction topology. To guarantee synchronization, one obviously requires some connectivity assumptions, preventing decomposition of the network into several clusters. In the next subsection necessary and sufficient conditions for synchronization under *fixed* topology are given.

B. Synchronization under fixed topology

In this section we confine ourselves to the case of the static interaction topology: $A(t) = (a_{ij}(t)) \equiv A$. It is convenient to describe this topology with a graph $G = (V, E)$ whose nodes are indexed 1 through N so that $V = \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$ and $E = \{(j,i) : a_{ij} = 1\}$. Hence, j is connected to i if the ith oscillator is influenced by the jth one. We call G the *interaction graph* of the network.

Our first main result is the following synchronization criterion under static interaction graph.

Theorem 2: Suppose that Assumptions 1, 2 and 3 hold and the interaction graph G is *rooted*. Then the coupling protocol (2),(4) provides asymptotic synchronization (6).

The rootedness is in fact the *minimal* connectivity assumption under which synchronization can be proved under arbitrary initial conditions (satisfying Assumption 3). An elegant result of [33, Theorem 5] states that if no root in the graph exists, then there are two non-empty disjoint subsets of nodes $V_1, V_2 \subset V$ such that no arc comes into V_i ($i = 1, 2$) from outside. Two groups of oscillators, corresponding to V_1 and V_2, are hence independent of each other and of the remaining network, and synchronization among them is not possible (except for some specially chosen initial conditions).

The main idea behind the proof of Theorem 2 is the contracting property of the protocol (2),(4) under Assumptions 1-3, similar to that of multi-agent *consensus protocols* [33]–[35]. A common approach to analysis of consensus algorithms uses the non-expanding convex hull, spanned by the agents' states, as the vector-valued Lyapunov function [33], [35]; the diameter of this hull is a (non-smooth) Lyapunov function [34]. Statements 2 and 3 of Theorem 1 suggest the use of the minimal arc $L(\bar\theta)$, containing the complex phases $e^{\imath\theta_j}$, as the rotating analogue of the states' convex hull, and its length $d(\bar\theta)$ as the Lyapunov function for the networked system (1),(2),(4). Obviously, synchronization (6) means that $d(\bar\theta(t)) \xrightarrow{t\to\infty} 0$.

To rigorously introduce the contraction property, it is convenient to use the concept of the *return map* [19], [38]. Given a vector $\bar\xi = (\xi_1, \dots, \xi_N) \in [0;2\pi]^N$ such that $d(\bar\xi) < \pi$, consider the solution of our system $\bar\theta(t) = \bar\theta(t|\bar\xi)$ with initial conditions $\theta_i(0) = \xi_i\, \forall i$. If $\xi_i = 2\pi$ for some i, we assume that the ith oscillator immediately fires an event and resets its phase to 0, after which the system evolves as usual. Let $t_i \ge 0$ be the time instant when the ith oscillator fires for the first time and $t_*(\bar\xi) = \max t_i(\bar\xi)$ is the time where the first cycle of firing has just finished (as implied by Theorem 1, none of oscillators fired twice during this time). Let $\bar\xi' = \theta(t_*(\bar\xi)+)$ be the state of the system after this full round of events.

Definition 3: The mapping $S : \bar\xi \mapsto \bar\xi'$ is called the *return map* of the system.

Lemma 1: The mapping $S(\bar\xi)$ is continuous at any point $\bar\xi$ with $d(\bar\xi) < \pi$: if $\bar\xi^{(n)} \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{} \bar\xi$ as $n \to \infty$ (in particularly, $d(\bar\xi^{(n)}) < \pi$ for large n), then $S(\bar\xi^{(n)}) \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{} S(\bar\xi)$.

Lemma 1 establishes the continuity of the trajectory with respect to the initial conditions. Notice, however, that this does not imply pointwise continuity: for $t \ge 0$ fixed, the phases $\bar\theta_j(t|\bar\xi)$ are discontinuous in some $\bar\xi$ because of the jumps (2).

It follows from Theorem 1 that $d(S(\bar\xi)) \le d(\bar\xi)$. A fundamental property of the delay-advance protocols with the delay-advance PRC maps, exploited in [17], [32] is the *contractivity* of such a map under assumption of the *strong connectivity*

of the interaction graph G. Namely, for the PRC map (7) and coupling gain $0 < c \leq 1$ it was shown in [32] that $d(S(\bar{\xi})) < d(\bar{\xi})$ whenever $d(\bar{\xi}) < \pi$. In the earlier paper [17] it was demonstrated, assuming that $\Psi(\theta) \equiv 2\pi$ as $\theta \approx 2\pi$, one can prove that $d(S(\bar{\xi})) \leq d(\bar{\xi}) - \varepsilon$ whenever $\varepsilon \leq d(\bar{\xi}) < \pi$ (and if $d(\bar{\xi}) < \varepsilon$ then $d(S(\bar{\xi})) = 0$), so that the protocol provides synchronization in finite time. Here $\varepsilon > 0$ is a constant, depending on the topology and the map $\Psi(\cdot)$.

These contraction properties *fail* without the strong connectivity assumption, as demonstrated by the following.

Example 1. Consider $N = 3$ oscillators with natural frequency $\omega = 1$rad/s that are connected in a chain $1 \mapsto 2 \mapsto 3$. Such a graph has the root node 1 but is not strongly connected. Suppose that oscillators start with $\theta_1(0) = 0$, $\theta_2(0) = \theta_3(0) = \theta_0 < \pi$. It is obvious that $t_2^1 = t_3^1 = 2\pi - \theta_0$, and their events do not affect oscillator 1 so that $\theta_1(t_2^1+) = \theta_1(t_2^1) = 2\pi - \theta_0$. Its firing at time $t_*^1 = t_1^1 = \theta_0$ does not affect oscillator 3, so the phases after the first cycle are $\theta_1(t_*^1+) = 0 < \theta_2(t_*^1+) = \Psi(\theta_0) < \theta_3(t_*^1+) = \theta_0$, and the diameter remains unchanged.

An extension of this example, dealing with $N > 3$ oscillators connected into a chain $1 \mapsto 2 \mapsto 3 \mapsto \ldots \mapsto N$ and starting at $\theta_1(0) = 0$ and $\theta_2(0) = \ldots = \theta_N(0) = \theta_0$, shows that the diameter can remain unchanged even under $(N-2)$ rounds of firing, since each of them will result in a configuration where $0 = \theta_1 < \theta_i \leq \theta_N = \theta_0 \, \forall i \neq 1, N$. However, after the $(N-1)$th cycle the diameter will decrease. The latter claim appears to be valid for any initial conditions and rooted interaction graph, as shown by the following.

Lemma 2: Let Assumptions 1 and 2 hold and G be a rooted graph. Then for any $\bar{\xi} \in [0; 2\pi]^N$ with $0 < d(\bar{\xi}) < \pi$ one has

$$d\left(S^{N-1}(\bar{\xi})\right) < d(\bar{\xi}), \quad S^k \triangleq \underbrace{S \circ S \circ \ldots \circ S}_{k \text{ times}}. \qquad (9)$$

A very important question, which is beyond the scope of this paper and remains open even for strongly connected graphs, is synchronization under *general* initial conditions. The existing results deal mainly with all-to-all or cyclic graphs [19], [28]–[30], [38] which guarantee some ordering of the oscillators' events and global contraction of the return map. For instance, as was noticed in [32], for the PRC map (7), $0.5 \leq c \leq 1$ and all-to-all coupling for *any* initial conditions the diameter of ensemble becomes less than π after the first event. The latter papers also reported some results, concerned with synchronization over "strongly rooted" (star-shaped) and connected bidirectional graphs under general initial condition.

C. Synchronization under switching topology

In this section, we consider synchronization of PCO networks under switching topology. In a real biological network the topology constantly evolves due e.g. to death and division of the cells or migrating of the biological agents. Dealing with wireless networks, the switching topology can also be caused by communication constraints, where the same communication channel has to be shared between several pairs of agents.

For first-order consensus algorithms the typical convergence condition is the *repeated* rootedness, referred to also as the *uniform quasi-strong connectivity* UQSC [34], [35], which means that the consecutive switches of the time-varying graph $G(t) = (V, E(t))$ are separated by a positive dwell time, and there exists such a period $\tau > 0$ that the union of the graphs $\bigcup_{t=t_0}^{t_0+\tau} G(t) = \left(V, \bigcup_{t=t_0}^{t_0+\tau} E(t)\right)$ is rooted for any $t_0 \geq 0$.

The following counterexample shows that generally neither the UQSC condition, nor even the constant rootedness of the graph is sufficient for synchronization under pulse coupling.

Example 2. Consider two oscillators (1), starting at $\theta_1(0) = 0$ and $\theta_2(0) \in (0; 2\pi)$ whose natural period is $T = 2\pi/\omega$. Being independent, these oscillators fire events at $T, 2T, \ldots$ and $t', t'+T, \ldots$ respectively, where $t' = T - \theta_2(0)/T \in (0; T)$. Let $t_0 = 0$, $t_1 = T - \varepsilon$, $t_2 = t' + T - \varepsilon$, $t_3 = 2T - \varepsilon$, $t_4 = t' + 2T - \varepsilon$ and so on, $t_{2k+2} = t_{2k} + T$, $t_{2k+1} = t_{2k-1} + T$; here $\varepsilon > 0$ is sufficiently small so that $t_0 < t' < t_1 < T < t_2 < t' + T < t_3 < 2T < \ldots$. We define the adjacency matrix as follows: $a_{12}(t) = 1 - a_{21}(t) = 0$ when $t \in (t_{2k}; t_{2k+1}]$ and $a_{12}(t) = 1 - a_{21}(t) = 1$ as $t \in (t_{2k+1}; t_{2k+2}]$ (here $k = 0, 1, \ldots$). When oscillator 2 fires for the first time ($t = t'$), one has $a_{12}(t) = 0$ and hence oscillator 1 remains unaffected; in its turn, it fires at $t = T$ when $a_{21}(t) = 0$ and does not affect oscillator 2. Retracing this argument, one shows that oscillators evolve independently since when one of them fires, the other remains unaffected. Note that the dwell time between the graph switchings $\tau_0 = \min(t', T - \varepsilon)$ can be arbitrarily close to T, and the graph is constantly rooted.

Nevertheless, the condition of repeated rootedness is sufficient for synchronization, assuming the dwell-time between switches sufficiently large; namely, we adopt the following.

Assumption 4: There exist a number $\mathcal{T} > T = 2\pi/\omega$, a sequence of *switching points* $0 \leq \tau_1 < \tau_2 < \ldots$ and a sequence of binary matrices $A_1, A_2, \ldots$, satisfying

a) $\tau_1 \leq 2\mathcal{T}$ and $\mathcal{T} \leq \tau_{k+1} - \tau_k \leq 2\mathcal{T}$ for any $k \geq 1$;
b) $A(t) \equiv A_1$ for $t \in (0; \tau_1)$ and $A(t) \equiv A_k$ when $t \in (\tau_{k-1}; \tau_k)$ and $k \geq 2$;
c) denoting the graph, corresponding to A_k, with G_k, there exists such an integer M that any union of M consequent graphs $\bigcup_{i=0}^{M} G_{k+i}$ $(k = 0, 1, \ldots)$ is rooted.

Essentially condition a) restricts the *dwell time* between consequent switches to be not less than $\mathcal{T}$. As shown by Example 2, this assumption cannot be fully discarded even for $N = 2$ oscillators[3]. Conditions $\tau_1 \leq 2\mathcal{T}, \tau_{k+1} - \tau_k \leq 2\mathcal{T}$ are non-restrictive and can always be provided (keeping the dwell time $\geq \mathcal{T}$) by adding fictitious switching points. Condition c) in Assumption 4 is the repeated rootedness. Note that Assumption 4 does not restrict the values $A(\tau_k)$ (for instance, we do not require that $A(\tau_k) = A_k$ or $A(\tau_k) = A_{k+1}$), although they *can influence* the system dynamics if one of the oscillators occasionally fires at this moment. It is possible, for instance, that at time $t = \tau_k$ the topology is totally disconnected, provided that repeated connectivity holds.

Sufficiency in Thorem 2 remains valid, replacing fixed rooted graph with time-varying one, satisfying Assumption 4.

[3]A special case where $\mathcal{T} = T$ and, moreover, $\tau_k = kT$, was addressed in [17]. This result stipulates the repeated *strong* connectivity and special form of the PRC map, providing synchronization in finite time. In general, synchronization in the critical case $\mathcal{T} = T$ remains an open problem.

Theorem 3: Suppose that Assumptions 1-4 hold. Then asymptotic synchronization (6) is established.

V. Numerical simulations

In this section, the results of Theorems 2 and 3 are confirmed by numerical tests.

We simulate a network of $N = 4$ identical oscillators, whose natural frequency is $\omega = 1$rad/s (and the period $T = 2\pi$ s), starting with phases $\theta_1 = \pi/2$, $\theta_2 = 0.3\pi$, $\theta_3 = 0.03\pi$ and $\theta_4 = 0.9\pi$. Thus, the initial diameter is $d(\bar{\theta}(0)) = 0.87\pi < \pi$.

A. Static topology case

We start with the static topology case and simulate the dynamics of the oscillators under the interaction graph, shown in Fig. 4. Notice that the graph in Fig.4 has an oriented spanning tree, but is *not* strongly connected because the phase of the "leading" oscillator 1 is unaffected by the others.



Fig. 4: The network topology

Two numerical tests were carried out, the first with $c = 0.4$ and the delay-advanced PRC $\Phi(\theta) = -\sin\theta$ (see Fig.5a), and the second with $c = 0.5$ and the PRC map as follows (Fig. 5b)

$$\Phi(\theta) = \begin{cases} -\theta, \theta \in [0; \pi/2) \\ \theta - \pi, \theta \in [\pi/2; 3\pi/2] \\ 2\pi - \theta, \theta \in (3\pi/2; 2\pi]. \end{cases} \quad (10)$$

The corresponding dynamics of oscillators' phases θ_1 (blue),



(a) $\Phi(\theta) = -\sin\theta$ (b) Piecewise-linear $\Phi(\theta)$

Fig. 5: Two PRC maps

θ_2 (orange), θ_3 (green) and θ_4 (red) are shown on Fig. 6, and Fig. 7 illustrates the corresponding event diagrams: the point (t, i) on the plot in Fig. 7 (where $t \geq 0$ and $i \in 1:4$) indicates that the ith oscillator fires an event at time t. Finally, Fig. 8 illustrates synchronization of phases on the unit circle S^1: plots (a)-(d) correspond to the case $\Phi(\theta) = -\sin\theta$, $c = 0.4$, and (e)-(h) illustrate the solution with $\Phi(\theta)$ from (10) and $c = 0.5$. Both numerical examples confirm Theorem 2, stating that the oscillators reach synchrony (6).



(a) $\Phi(\theta) = -\sin\theta$, $c = 0.4$ (b) $\Phi(\theta)$ from (10), $c = 0.5$

Fig. 6: Dynamics of phases $\theta_i(t)$



(a) $\Phi(\theta) = -\sin\theta$, $c = 0.4$ (b) $\Phi(\theta)$ from (10), $c = 0.5$

Fig. 7: Event diagrams.

B. The case of time-varying graph

Our next numerical test is to illustrate Theorem 3. Unlike the previous tests, the interagent links depicted in Fig. 4 are not available simultaneously, but are turned on one-by-one, and as soon as a link is activated, the previous one becomes unavailable. In other word, each of the interaction graphs G_k in Theorem 3 consists of $N = 4$ nodes and the only arc $e_{i(k)}$. This situation occurs, for instance, if oscillators share the same communication channel, so that at any time only one pair of oscillators communicates.

For our test, we take the PRC map (7), which is typically used in time synchronization problems [16], and $c = 0.9$. We choose the dwell-time $\mathcal{T} = 1.001\,T$, the switching instants being generated by a random Markov process: τ_1 is uniformly distributed in $[0; \mathcal{T}]$, and as the instant τ_k is sampled, τ_{k+1} is uniformly distributed in the interval $[\tau_k + \mathcal{T}; \tau_k + 2\mathcal{T}]$. We assume that the order in which the arcs e_i are activated is

$$e_1, e_2, e_3, e_4, e_5, e_1, e_2, e_3, e_4, e_5, \ldots, \quad \text{and so on.} \quad (11)$$

It is obvious that the union of each $M = 5$ consequent graphs G_i give the graph in Fig. 4 and hence the conditions of Theorem 3 are satisfied. The dynamics of phases and the event diagram of are illustrated in Fig. 9, which shows that oscillators get synchronized, as claimed by Theorem 3.

It should be noticed that permuting the order in which arcs are activated, e.g. replacing sequence (11) with

$$e_1, e_3, e_2, e_4, e_5, e_1, e_3, e_2, e_4, e_5, \ldots, , \quad (12)$$

one can get quite different dynamics whose convergence to synchronous manifold is much slower, as demonstrated by Fig. 10. Simulations show that when the active link switches accordingly to (12), the oscillators become synchronous in 5000s versus 50s under the link switching order (11). Hence, the convergence rate of the protocol not only depends on the PRC map and dwell-time $\mathcal{T}$, but is also very sensitive to the structure of the interaction topology. Estimating this rate is a



(a) $t = 0$s (b) $t = 22$s (c) $t = 42$s (d) $t = 100$s



(e) $t = 0$s (f) $t = 22$s (g) $t = 42$s (h) $t = 100$s

Fig. 8: Phases on S^1 at four time instants.



(a) Phases $\theta_i(t)$ (b) Event diagram

Fig. 9: Synchronization: the arcs e_i appear in order (11)

non-trivial open problem, lying beyond the scope of our paper.



(a) $t = 0$s (b) $t = 50$s (c) $t = 1000$s (d) $t = 5000$s

Fig. 10: Phases on S^1: the arcs e_i appear in order (12).

VI. Proofs

This section is organized as follows. We start with the proof of Theorem 1 (Subsect. VI-A) and establish some important properties of solutions. Theorem 2 and related technical Lemmas 1,2 are proved in Subsect. VI-B. Prove of Theorem 3, given in Subsect. VI-D, requires some "compactification" of the set of trajectories, which is constructed in Subsect. VI-C.

A. Proof of Theorem 1

In this subsection, Assumptions 1-3 are supposed to hold.

1) Proof of statement 1: Here we prove the first claim of Theorem 1, concerned with the solution existence, and also part of the last claim. We say that the solution $\bar\theta(t) = \{\theta_i(t)\}_{i=1}^N$ of the system (1),(2),(4) is *well defined* on an interval $\Delta = [0;\delta)$, where $0 < \delta < \infty$, if Δ contains *finite* number of firing instants t_i, at which $\bar\theta$ is left-continuous, and the limit $\bar\theta(\delta-) \in [0;2\pi]$ exists.

For any $\bar\theta(0) \in [0;2\pi)^N$ the solution exists, unique and is well-defined on a sufficiently short interval $\Delta = [0;\delta)$, for instance, when $\delta = \delta_0 = T - \max\theta_i(0)/\omega > 0$ (as $t \in [0;\delta_0)$, the oscillators run freely $\dot\theta_i = \omega$ and no events are fired). Let $\Delta_* = [0;\delta_*)$ be the *union* of all such intervals; we are going to show that $\delta_* = \infty$. To do so, we need the following lemma.

Lemma 3: Let the jth oscillator fire an event at time $t_* > 0$. Then on interval $(t_*; t_* + T/2] \cap \Delta_*$ one has $0 < \theta_j(t) \le \omega(t - t_*)$, and hence it fires no other events.

Proof: Let $t' \le t_* + T/2$ and $t' < \delta_*$. The solution is well-defined on $[0;t']$, so during the interval $(t_*;t')$ only *finite* number of events are fired by the oscillators; denote the corresponding instants by $t_1 < t_2 < \ldots < t_k$. On the interval $(t_*;t_1)$ the oscillators obey $\dot\theta_i = \omega\,\forall i$, and hence $\theta_j(t_1) = \omega(t_1 - t_*) \in (0;\pi]$. Thus $0 < \theta_j(t_1+) \le \theta_j(t_1)$ by Assumptions 1,2. Therefore, $\theta_j(t_2) \le \theta_j(t_1) + \omega(t_2 - t_1) = \omega(t_2 - t_*) \in (0;\pi]$, so that $0 < \theta_j(t_1+) \le \theta_j(t_2)$ and so on. Finally, $\theta_j(t') \le \theta_j(t_k) + \omega(t' - t_k) \le \omega(t' - t_*) \in (0;\pi]$. ■

Now we are ready to show that $\delta_* = \infty$. Assume, on the contrary, that $\delta_* < \infty$ and hence on Δ_* only *finite* number of events are fired due to Lemma 3. Denoting the last reset time with t_*, one obtains that on $(t_*;\delta_*)$ the oscillators run freely ($\dot\theta_i(t) = \omega$, $\theta_i(t) \in [0;2\pi)$ as $t_* < t < \delta_*$), and hence the solution can be uniquely prolonged at least to a sufficiently small interval $[\delta_*;\delta_* + \varepsilon]$. We arrive at the contradiction, so the piecewise-continuous solution exists, is unique and prolongable up to ∞ under any initial condition. Furthermore, Lemma 3 excludes the possibility of the Zeno behavior: the firing instants cannot accumulate at a finite point. ■

2) Proofs of statements 2 and 3: Let $L(0) = L(\bar\theta(0)) \subset \mathbb{S}^1$ be the minimal arc, containing $e^{\imath\theta_j(0)}$, we are going to show that the arc $\mathcal{L}_t = e^{\imath\omega t}L(0) = \{e^{\imath\omega t}z : z \in L(0)\}$ contains all the points $e^{\imath\theta_j(t)}$, and hence $d(\bar\theta(t)) \le d(\bar\theta(0)) < \pi$ and $\mathcal{L}_t \supseteq L(t)$, where $L(t) = L(\bar\theta(t))$ is the (unique) minimal arc, containing $e^{\imath\theta_j(t)}$. Let the sequence of events in the system be triggered at moments $0 < t_1 < t_2 < \ldots$; Lemma 3 implies that any bounded interval $[0;t]$ contains only finite number of t_i. By definition, for $t < t_1$ and $t \in (t_i;t_{i+1})$ we have $\dot\theta_i = \omega$, so $e^{\imath\theta_i(t)} = e^{\imath\omega t + \imath\theta_i(0)} \in \mathcal{L}_t$ and $e^{\imath\theta_i(t_1)} \in \mathcal{L}_{t_1}\,\forall i$ by the left-continuity. Our goal is to show that $e^{\imath\theta_i(t_1+)} \in \mathcal{L}_{t_1}\,\forall i$. This is obvious from (1) if the ith oscillator fires or is not affected by the event. Otherwise, notice that $\theta_i(t_1) \ne \pi$ since otherwise $e^{\imath\omega t}L_0$ would consider the points -1 (corresponding to $\theta_i = \pi$) and 1 (some other phase $\theta_j = 2\pi$), whereas its length in radians is $|L_0| < \pi$ by Assumption 3. Hence we either have $\theta_i(t_1) \in (0;\pi)$ and then $0 < \theta_i(t_1+) < \theta_i(t_1)$, or $\theta_i(t_1) \in (\pi;2\pi)$ which entails that $2\pi > \theta_i(t_1+) > \theta_i(t_1)$ (see Fig.2). In both cases we have $e^{\imath\theta_i(t_1+)} \in \mathcal{L}_{t_1}$, entailing that $e^{\imath\theta_i(t)} \in \mathcal{L}_t$ as $t_1 < t < t_2$ and hence $e^{\imath\theta_i(t_2)}, e^{\imath\theta_i(t_2+)} \in L_{t_2}$, and so on. Since $t_k \to \infty$, one has $e^{\imath\theta_j(t)} \in L_t$ for any $t \ge 0$. In particular, $d(\bar\theta(t)) \le d(\bar\theta(0)) < \pi$ and $L(t) \subseteq \mathcal{L}_t = e^{\imath\omega t}L_0$ as $t \ge 0$. Replacing 0 with t', one proves that $d(\bar\theta(t')) \le d(\bar\theta(t))$ and $L(t') \subseteq e^{\imath\omega(t'-t)}L(t)$ whenever $t' \ge t \ge 0$. ■

3) Proof of statement 4: The first inequality follows from Lemma 3. The second inequality is implied by the following, which can be proved analogously to Lemma 4 and exploits the fact that $(\pi;2\pi)$ is invariant under the PTC mapping $\Psi(\cdot)$.

Lemma 4: Let Assumptions 1 and 2 hold and $\theta_j(t_0) \in (\pi; 2\pi)$. Then the jth oscillator fires (only once) during the interval $(t_0; t_0 + T/2]$; if this occurs at time t_1, then $\theta_j(t) - \theta_j(t_0) \geq \omega(t - t_0)$ as $t \in (t_0; t_1)$.

Consider now arbitrary initial phases $\theta_i(0) \in [0; 2\pi]$, satisfying Assumption 3. Let $\theta_* = \max_j \theta_j(0)$ and $J = \{j : \theta_j(0) = \theta_*\}$. The oscillators with indices from J fire first at time instant $t_* = T - \theta_*/\omega$, and accordingly to statement 3 we have $\theta_i(t_*) \geq 2\pi - d(0) > \pi$ for any $i \notin J$. Therefore, all the remaining oscillators fire during $(t_*; t_* + d(0)/\omega]$ due to Lemma 4. Since $d(0) = \theta_* - \min_j \theta_j(0) \leq \theta_*$, all the oscillators fire (for the first time) no later than $t_* + d(0)/\omega = T - (\theta_* - d(0))/\omega \leq T$. Oscillators indexed with $j \in J$ trigger the next event no sooner than at $t = t_* + T/2 > t_* + d(0)/\omega$ by Lemma 3. We have shown that during the time interval $[0; T]$ any of oscillator fires, and between two events of the "leading" oscillators all the remaining oscillators should fire. Replacing now $\theta_i(0)$ with $\theta_i(t)$, the same arguments may be retraced for the interval $[t; t + T]$, proving thus statement 4.■

B. Proof of Theorem 2 and properties of the return map

In this subsection, we assume that assumptions of Theorem 2 hold, in particular, the matrix $A = (a_{ij})$ (and thus the topology) is fixed. We start with proving Lemmas 1 and 2.

1) Proof of Lemma 1: Let us fix $\bar{\xi} \in [0; 2\pi]^N$ and consider a sequence $\bar{\xi}^{(n)} \in [0; 2\pi]^N$ such that $\bar{\xi}^{(n)} \to \bar{\xi}$ as $n \to \infty$. Let $\bar{\theta}^{(n)}(t), \bar{\theta}(t)$ be the corresponding solutions of (1),(2),(4). We are going to show that $S(\bar{\xi}^{(n)}) = \bar{\theta}^{(n)}(t_*(\bar{\xi}^{(n)})+) \to S(\bar{\xi})$ and $t_j(\bar{\xi}^{(n)}) \to t_j(\bar{\xi})$ for any j as $n \to \infty$, where t_j is the first time when the jth oscillator fires. Suppose first for simplicity that $t_i(\bar{\xi}) \neq t_j(\bar{\xi})$ for all $i \neq j$. Renumbering the oscillators, without loss of generality one may assume that $t_1(\bar{\xi}) < \ldots < t_N(\bar{\xi})$, in particular, $\xi_1 = \max_j \xi_j$. Then we have $t_1(\bar{\xi}) = t_0 + (T - \xi_1/\omega)$ and thus it is obvious that $t_1(\bar{\xi}^{(n)}) = T - \xi_1^{(n)}/\omega \to t_1(\bar{\xi})$ since we have $\xi_1^{(n)} = \max_j \xi_j^{(n)}$ as n is sufficiently large. Furthermore, it is obvious that the system state after the first reset $\bar{\xi}_+^{(n)} \triangleq \theta^{(n)}(t_1(\bar{\xi}^n)+) \to \bar{\xi}_+ \triangleq \theta(t_1(\bar{\xi})+)$ as $n \to \infty$. Substituting now $\bar{\xi} \mapsto \bar{\xi}_+$, $t_0 \mapsto t_1^1(\bar{\xi})$ and renumbering oscillators $(1, 2, \ldots, N) \mapsto (2, 3, \ldots, N, 1)$, one can retrace the arguments and obtain now that $t_2(\bar{\xi}^{(n)}) \to t_2(\bar{\xi})$ and $\theta^{(n)}(t_2(\bar{\xi}^n)+) \to \theta(t_2(t_0, \bar{\xi})+)$ as $n \to \infty$, and so on, $t_N(\bar{\xi}^{(n)}) \to t_N(\bar{\xi})$ and $S(\bar{\xi}^{(n)}) = \theta^{(n)}(t_N(\bar{\xi}^n)+) \to \theta(t_N(\bar{\xi})+) = S(\bar{\xi})$, which ends the proof in the "generic" case. The case where some oscillators may fire simultaneously is considered likewise but for one difference. Assume again that oscillators are sorted in the order of their first firing $t_1(\bar{\xi}) \leq \ldots \leq t_N(\bar{\xi})$. Suppose e.g. the $t_1(\bar{\xi}) = t_2(\bar{\xi}) = \ldots = t_l(\bar{\xi}) < t_{l+1}(\bar{\xi})$, that is, the first l oscillators fire simultaneously. It is easily shown then that $t_i(\bar{\xi}^{(n)}) \to t_i(\bar{\xi})$ for $i = 1, 2, \ldots, l$ as $n \to \infty$, and for large n the first l oscillators fire earlier than the remaining ones. A crucial difference is that one can no longer prove that $\theta^{(n)}(t_1(\bar{\xi}^n)+) \to \theta(t_1(\bar{\xi})+)$ since the state in the right hand side was produced by the cluster burst of l events, whereas for $\bar{\xi}^{(n)}$ these events are *not* necessarily simultaneous. Nevertheless, an easy computation shows that

$$\bar{\xi}_+^{(n)} \triangleq \theta(\max_{1 \leq i \leq l} t_i(\bar{\xi}^n)+) \to \bar{\xi}_+ \triangleq \theta(t_1(\bar{\xi})+).$$

So the phases after l consequent event appear to be continuous at $\bar{\xi}$, no matter if these events are simultaneous or not. Substituting now $\bar{\xi} \mapsto \bar{\xi}_+$ and renumbering oscillators, one again can iterate this procedure as was done in the non-degenerate case, and prove that both $t_j(\bar{\xi}^{(n)}) \to t_j(\bar{\xi})$ and $S(\bar{\xi}^{(n)}) = \bar{\theta}^{(n)}(t_*(\bar{\xi}^{(n)})+) \to S(\bar{\xi})$ as $n \to \infty$. ■

2) Proof of Lemma 2: Let $L(t)$ be the arc of minimal length, containing the points $e^{\imath\theta_j(t)}$, and the sets of its endpoints are $\{e^{\imath\theta_j(t)} : j \in J_-(t)\}$ and $\{e^{\imath\theta_j(t)} : j \in J_+(t)\}$ respectively; the shortest turn from points from $J_-(t)$ to those from $J_+(t)$ is counterclockwise, see Fig.11. A closer look at the proof of statements 2 and 3 in Theorem 1 reveals that at any event time t_* the following alternatives are possible:

A) oscillators from $J_-(t_*), J_+(t_*)$ are unaffected by the firing oscillator(s), then $|L(t_*+)| = |L(t_*)|$ and $J_-(t_*) = J_-(t_*+)$, $J_+(t_*) = J_+(t_*+)$;
B) some of the "extremal" oscillators are affected, but $|L(t_*+)| = |L(t_*-)|$. In this case $J_-(t_*+) \subseteq J_-(t_*-)$ and $J_+(t_*+) \subseteq J_+(t_*-)$ and one of inclusions is strict;
C) the length is decreasing: $|L(t_*+)| < |L(t_*-)|$.

It may be noticed that during the cycle of N consequent events (triggered by all oscillators) at least once the second or the third alternative must take place. Otherwise, one would have two disjoint sets of nodes $J_-(t_*-)$, $J_+(t_*-)$ without incoming arcs that is not possible for a rooted graph [33, Theorem 5]. Since the cardinality of $J_-(t) \cup J_+(t)$ is not greater than N, after $N - 1$ full rounds of firing the length of the minimal arc necessarily decreases. In other words, $d(S^{N-1}(\bar{\xi})) < d(\bar{\xi})$ whenever $0 < d(\bar{\xi}) < \pi$. ■



Fig. 11: Example: L is drawn red, $J_- = \{3, 5\}$, $J_+ = \{2, 4, 6\}$

3) Proof of Theorem 2: Let a solution $\bar{\theta}(t)$ start at $\bar{\xi}_0 = \bar{\theta}(0)$, where $d(\bar{\xi}_0) = d_0 < \pi$. As follows from Theorem 1, there exists the limit $d_* \triangleq \lim_{t \to \infty} d(\bar{\theta}(t)) = \inf_{t \geq 0} d(\bar{\theta}(t))$, and we are going to show that $d_* = 0$. Assume on the contrary that $d_* > 0$. Since S is a continuous map, there exists $\max_{d_* \leq d(\bar{\xi}) \leq d_0} \left[d(S^{N-1}(\bar{\xi})) - d(\bar{\xi})\right] = -m_0 < 0$. By definition of S, one has $d_* \leq d(S^r(\bar{\xi}_0)) \leq d_0$ for any $r = 1, 2, \ldots$ (indeed, $S^r(\bar{\xi}_0)$ is a point on the trajectory $\bar{\theta}(t)$). Therefore, one has $d_* \leq S^{(N-1)k}(\bar{\xi}_0) \leq d(S^{(N-1)(k-1)}(\bar{\xi}_0)) - M \leq \ldots \leq d(\bar{\xi}_0) - km_0$ for any $k \geq 1$. This contradiction proves that $d_0 = 0$, which ends the proof of Theorem 2.

C. Time-varying topology case: preliminaries

Given a matrix-valued function $A(\cdot)$ and initial condition $\bar{\theta}(0) = \bar{\xi}$ (we adopt here notation from Section IV-B), let $\bar{\theta}(t) = \bar{\theta}(t|\bar{\xi}, A(\cdot))$ be (the unique) solution of the system (1),(5),(4), existing in accordance with Theorem 1. For this solution, let $t_j^r = t_j^r(\bar{\xi}, A(\cdot))$ be the time when the jth oscillator fires its rth event (here $j = 1, \dots, N$ and $r \geq 1$); let $t_*^r = \max_j t_j^r$ be the termination time of the r round of firing. We denote the state of the system after the rth round with $\bar{\theta}_*^r(\bar{\xi}, A(\cdot)) \stackrel{\Delta}{=} \bar{\theta}(t_*^r + |\bar{\xi}, A(\cdot))$. Due to Theorem 1, we have $t_i^l < t_j^{l+1}$ for any $i, j = 1, \dots, N$ and $l \geq 1$.

Remark 1: Examining the proof of Theorem 1, one can see that $\min_j t_j^{l+1} - \max_j t_j^l \geq (\pi - d(\bar{\xi}))/\omega > 0$. Theorem 1 implies also that $t_j^r \leq rT$, which entails that the values t_j^r, $t_*^r, \bar{\theta}_*^r$ depend only on the truncated function $A(\cdot)|_{[0;rT]}$.

We start with proving contraction property of the protocol under Assumption 4.

Lemma 5: For any $\mathcal{T} > T$ and $M \geq 1$ there exists a number $r = r(\mathcal{T}, M)$ such that $d(\bar{\theta}_*^r(\bar{\xi}, A(\cdot))) < d(\bar{\xi})$ for any initial condition with $0 < d(\bar{\xi}) < \pi$ and $A(\cdot)$, satisfying Assumption 4.

Proof: Let $0 < d(\bar{\xi}) < \pi$ and $A(\cdot)$ satisfy Assumption 4 and $\bar{\theta}(t) = \bar{(}t|\bar{\xi}, A(\cdot))$ be the corresponding solution. Follow the line of the proof of Lemma 2, we introduce the minimal arc $L(t)$, whose endpoints correspond to sets of indices $J_-(t)$ and $J_+(t)$ (see Fig.11). As was noticed, after each event only one of the alternatives A)-C) is possible. We are going to show that during the interval $(0; \tau_M)$ either B) and C) occurs at least once. Indeed, suppose that on the contrary that neither situation B) nor C) occur, and hence $J_-(t) = J_-$ and $J_+(t) = J_+$ remain unchanged as $0 \leq t < \tau_M$. Since the union of the graphs $\bigcup_{i=1}^M G_i$ is rooted, in one of them either J_- or J_+ has an incoming arc. Assume, for definiteness, that for some i some $k \notin J_+$ is connected to $j \in J_+$ in G_i. Since $A(t) = A_i = const$ for $t \in \Delta_i \stackrel{\Delta}{=} (\tau_{i-1}; \tau_i)$ (here we put $\tau_0 = 0$) and $\tau_i - \tau_{i-1} > T$, oscillator fires at least once on the interval Δ_i, after which either $L(t)$ shrinks or j leaves $J_+(t)$, and we arrive at the contradiction. Similarly, B) or C) happens during each interval $(\tau_M; \tau_{2M})$, $(\tau_{2M}; \tau_{3M})$ and so on. Since B) leads to decreasing of $|J_-(t)| + |J_+(t)|$, one has $d(\bar{\theta}(\tau_{(N-1)M})) < d(\bar{\xi})$. Notice now that $\tau_{(N-1)M} \leq 2\mathcal{T}(N-1)M$ and length of any *two* consequent cycles is greater than $T/2$ due to Theorem 1. Therefore, the interval $[0; \tau_{(N-1)M}$ contains at most $r_0 = 2\lfloor 4\mathcal{T}(N-1)M/T \rfloor$ cycles. Choosing $r = r_0 + 1$, the rth cycle ends after $\tau_{(N-1)M}$ and hence $d(\bar{\theta}_*^r(\bar{\xi}, A(\cdot))) \leq d(\bar{\theta}(\tau_{(N-1)M})) < d(\bar{\xi})$. ∎

It may seem that Theorem 3 can be proved now by retracing the proof of Theorem 2, whose main idea was to exploit the "uniformity" of the inequality $d(\bar{\theta}_*^r(\bar{\xi}, A(\cdot))) < d(\bar{\xi})$ as $0 < d_0 \leq d(\bar{\xi}) \leq d_1 < \pi$ (in the proof of Theorem 2 we had $r = N - 1$ and such a uniformity was proven via technical Lemma 1). Essentially, this uniformity under static graph $A(\cdot) \equiv A$ is based on *compactness* of the set of trajectories in the following sense: any sequence of trajectories $\bar{\theta}^{(n)}$ contains such a subsequence $\bar{\theta}^{(n_k)}$ such that $\bar{\xi}^{(n_k)} = \bar{\theta}^{(n_k)}(0) \to \bar{\xi}$ as $k \to \infty$, and hence $\theta_*^r(\bar{\xi}^{(n_k)}, A) \to \theta_*^r(\bar{\xi}, A)$ as $k \to \infty$ via Lemma 1. This implies that one cannot find a sequence such that $d(\bar{\xi}^{(n)}) \in [d_0; d_1]$ but $d(\bar{\theta}_*^r(\bar{\xi}^{(n)}, A) - d(\bar{\xi}^{(n)}) \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$, i.e. $d(\bar{\theta}_*^r(\bar{\xi}^{(n)}, A) - d(\bar{\xi}^{(n)}) \leq -\varepsilon < 0$. Such a compactness, however, fails for the time-varying topology; and to "compactify" the set of trajectories respecting to this convergence, we enrich it with some *extended* solutions, that are non-uniquely defined at the graph switching points τ_k.

Given $\xi \in [0; 2\pi]$, we define the set

$$\Theta_0(\xi) = \begin{cases} \{0\}, & \xi \in \{0; 2\pi\} \\ (0; \xi], & \xi \in (0; \pi) \\ [\xi; 2\pi), & \xi \in (\pi; 2\pi) \\ [0; 2\pi), & \xi = \pi. \end{cases} \tag{13}$$

Now we define a multi-valued map $\bar{\xi} \in [0; 2\pi]^N \mapsto \Theta(\bar{\xi}) \subseteq [0; 2\pi)^N$ as the following Cartesian product:

$$\Theta(\bar{\xi}) = \prod_{i=1}^N \Theta_0(\xi_i) = \{(\theta_i)_{i=1}^N : \theta_i \in \Theta_0(\xi_i)\}. \tag{14}$$

Definition 4: Let $A(\cdot)$ satisfy Assumption 4. A function $\bar{\theta}(t) = (\theta_i(t))_{i=1}^N$ is said to be *extended solution* of the system, if satisfies (1),(2),(4) everywhere except the switching points τ_i. If one or several oscillators fire sharply at τ_s, then (2),(4) may fail, however, the inclusion holds

$$\bar{\theta}(\tau_s+) \in \Theta(\bar{\theta}(\tau_s)), \quad \text{if an event is fired at } \tau_s. \tag{15}$$

That is, at the graph switching points an event initiated by an oscillator may cause *any* jumps of the remaining oscillators, under which the minimal arc does not expand (see Fig. 2).

Under Assumptions 1 and 2 any normal solution of (1),(5),(4) is an extended solution, since $\Psi(\theta), \dots, \Psi^N(\theta) \in \Theta_0(\theta)\, \forall \theta \in [0; 2\pi]$ and hence $\bar{\theta}(t+) \in \Theta(\bar{\theta}(t))$ for any $t \geq 0$.

Remark 2: Analysis of the proof of Theorem 1, one can check that it remains valid for extended solutions but for the uniqueness. The only difference is concerned with the case where an event is fired at a switching point τ_j; in this case instead of the properties of the PTC mapping Ψ (i.e. Assumptions 1,2) one uses the inclusion $\bar{\theta}(\tau_j+) \in \Theta(\bar{\theta}(\tau_j))$. Hence, for extended solutions the functions t_j^r and Θ_*^r are well-defined. Since the proof of Lemma 5 does not employ (2),(4) at $t = \tau_j$, it also retains its validity for extended solutions.

D. Proof of Theorem 3

To finalize the proof of Theorem 3, we are going to prove the following extension of Lemma 5.

Lemma 6: Suppose that Assumptions 2,1,4 hold. For any numbers $d_0, d_1 \in (0; \pi)$, where $d_0 < d_1$, $\mathcal{T} > 0$ and $M \geq 1$ there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that for any $\bar{\xi} \in [0; 2\pi]^N$ with $d_0 \leq d(\bar{\xi}) \leq d_1$ and matrix $A(\cdot)$, satisfying Assumption 4, one has

$$d(\bar{\xi}) - d(\theta_*^r(\bar{\xi}, A(\cdot))) \geq \varepsilon. \tag{16}$$

Here $r = r(\mathcal{T}, M)$ was defined in Lemma 5.

Proof: Assume on the contrary that a sequence of initial conditions $\bar{\xi}^{(n)}$ and topologies $A^{(n)}(\cdot)$, such that $d(\bar{\xi}^{(n)}) - d(\theta_*^r(\bar{\xi}, A^{(n)}(\cdot))) \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$. Denoting switching points of $A^{(n)}(\cdot)$ by $\tau_j^{(n)}$, let $A_j^{(n)}$ stand for the constant value of $A^{(n)}$ on $(\tau_j^{(n-1)}; \tau_j^{(n)})$. Let $t_j^{m,(n)}$ stands for the event instants

of the corresponding trajectories $\bar\theta^{(n)}(t)=\bar\theta(t|\bar\xi^{(n)},A^{(n)}(\cdot))$ and $\hat A_j^{m,(n)}=A^{(n)}(t_j^{m,(n)})$ be the adjacency matrices at these instants. Passing to a subsequence, one may assume that the following limits as $n\to\infty$ exist

$$\begin{gathered}\bar\xi\triangleq\lim\bar\xi^{(n)},\ \tau_m\triangleq\lim\tau_m^{(n)},\ t_j^m\triangleq\lim t_j^{m,(n)}\\ \bar\theta^{j,m}\triangleq\lim\bar\theta^{(n)}\big(t_j^{m,(n)}\big),\bar\theta^{j,m,+}\triangleq\lim\bar\theta^{(n)}(t_j^{m,(n)}+).\end{gathered}\tag{17}$$

Furthermore, as the number of binary $N\times N$ matrices is finite, one may assume, passing to a subsequence, that $A_m^{(n)}\equiv A_m$ and $\hat A_j^{m,(n)}\equiv\hat A_j^m$ for any $n\geq 1$. Here $m=1,2,\dots,r$ and $j=1,2,\dots,N$. One also may assume that the order of the oscillators' firing during first r cycles is independent of n.

Obviously one has $\tau_1\leq 2\mathcal{T}$ and $\mathcal{T}\leq\tau_i-\tau_{i-1}\leq 2\mathcal{T}$ for $i=2,\dots,r$. Define a time-varying binary matrix $A(t)$, where $t\in[0;\tau_r)$ by putting $A|_{(0;\tau_1)}\equiv A_1$ and $A|_{(\tau_{r-1};\tau_r)}\equiv A_r$ for $r\geq 2$, whereas $A(\tau_i)$ can be arbitrary. Obviously, $A(\cdot)$ can be prolonged to a matrix-valued function, satisfying Assumption 4. We are going to show now that the trajectories $\bar\theta^{(n)}(t)$ converge to one of *extended* solutions, corresponding to $A(\cdot)$ (as was noticed, such a solution may be non-unique).

We assume that oscillators are sorted in the order of their firing during this round, i.e. $t_1^{1,(n)}\leq\ldots\leq t_N^{1,(n)}$ for any n. This implies that $\xi_1^{(n)}=\max_j\xi_j^{(n)}$ for any n and hence $\xi_1=\max_j\xi_j$. Suppose for the moment that $t_1^1<t_2^1$. It can be noticed that in this situation $\xi_1>\xi_j$ for $j>1$. Indeed, otherwise one has $\xi_1^{(n)}-\xi_i^{(n)}\to 0$ as $n\to\infty$ for some $i>1$. Considering the nth solution $\bar\theta^{(n)}$, this entails that for large n the ith oscillator's phase $\theta_i(t)$ is arbitrarily close to 2π at $t=t_1^{1,(n)}$ when oscillator 1 fires. Lemma 4 implies that $t_1^{1,(n)}-t_i^{1,(n)}\to 0$ and thus $t_1^1=t_i^1$. Conversely, if $\xi_1>\xi_i$ for any $i>1$, then it can be easily shown that $t_1^1<t_2^1$.

We now define $\bar\theta(t)\in[0;2\pi]^N$ for $t\in[0;t_1^1]$ as follows: $\bar\theta(0)=\bar\xi$ and $\dot\theta_j(t)=\omega$ for any j when $t\in[0;t_1^1)$, and $\bar\theta(t_1^1)\triangleq\bar\theta(t_1^1-)$. It can be easily shown that $\bar\theta(t_1^1)=\bar\theta^{1,1}$ and $\theta_1(t_1^1)=2\pi>\theta_j(t_1^1)$ for any $j>1$. Define now $\bar\theta(t_1^1+)\triangleq\bar\theta^{1,1,+}$. Since along each solution $\bar\theta^{(n)}$ the interaction topology at $t=t_1^{1,(n)}$ corresponds to the same adjacency matrix $\hat A_1^1$ and (2) holds for $\bar\theta^{(n)}(\cdot)$ and $A=\hat A_1^1$, (2) remains valid for $\bar\theta^{(n)}(\cdot)$ and $\hat A_1^1$ as well. Notice now that either $t_1^1<\tau_1$ and then $\hat A_1^1=A(t_1^1)$ by construction or $t_1^1=\tau_1$ and then (15) holds. This implies that $\bar\theta(t)$ is an extended solution, defined up to t_1^1+ and corresponding to the topology $A(\cdot)$. The same construction can be carried out in the case where $t_1^1=t_2^1=\ldots=t_k^1<t_{k+1}^1$. One can check that the latter condition holds if and only if $\xi_1=\xi_2=\ldots=\xi_k>\xi_i$ for any $i>k$. Assuming that t_1^1 is *not* a switching point, one has $A_1^1=\ldots=A_k^1=A(t_1^1)$ and, like in the proof of Lemma 1, putting $\bar\theta(t_1^1+)\triangleq\bar\theta^{k,1,+}$ (the limit of state vectors after k consecutive events) one can check that (4) holds at $t=t_1^1$. In the case where $t_1^1=\tau_1$ application of (2) and (4) to each of the solutions $\bar\theta^{(n)}$ leads to (15).

Replacing now 0 with t_1^1 and ξ with $\bar\theta\big(t_1^1+\big)$, renumbering oscillators and repeating this construction, one can prolong $\bar\theta(t)$ from $t_1^1=\ldots=t_k^1$ up to t_{k+1}^1+, and so on. As a result, one obtains an extended solution $\bar\theta(t)$, defined up to t_*^r+ (where $t_*^r\triangleq\max_j t_j^r$), to which the solution $\bar\theta^{(n)}$ converge in the sense that $\bar\theta^{(n)}(t_*^{k,(n)}+)\to\bar\theta(t_*^k+)$ for each $k=1,2,\dots,r$. Since $\theta_*^r(\bar\xi,A(\cdot))=\bar\theta(t_*^r+)=\lim\limits_{n\to\infty}\theta_*^{r,(n)}(\bar\xi^{(n)},A^{(n)}(\cdot))$, we have $d(\bar\xi)-d(\theta_*^r(\bar\xi,A(\cdot)))=0$, which, however, contradicts Lemma 5, retaining its validity for extended solutions (Remark 2). This finishes the proof. ■

Proof of Theorem 3. Suppose that assumptions of Theorem 3 hold and let $\bar\xi=\bar\theta(0)$. By Assumption 3 we have $d_1\triangleq d(\bar\xi)<\pi$. If synchronization (6) is not established, then $d_0\triangleq\lim_{t\to\infty}d(\bar\theta(t))>0$. Let ε be the constant from Lemma 6, so that (18) holds. By noticing that the shifted function $\tilde A(t)=A(t+t_*^r)$ satisfies Assumption 4 as well, one can now apply Lemma 6 to $\bar\xi_1=\bar\theta_*^r(\bar\xi)$ (which satisfies $d_0\leq d(\bar\xi_1)\leq d_1$ due to Theorem 1), proving that

$$d(\theta_*^r(\bar\xi,A(\cdot)))-d(\theta_*^{2r}(\bar\xi,A(\cdot)))\geq\varepsilon.\tag{18}$$

Repeating this process, one shows that $d(\theta_*^{kr}(\bar\xi,A(\cdot)))\leq d(\bar\xi)-k\varepsilon\to-\infty$ as $k\to\infty$, arriving at the contradiction. ■

VII. Conclusions

The phenomenon of synchronization under pulse couplings, inherent to many biological networks, inspired efficient algorithms for clock synchronization in computer networks. In this paper, we examine the dynamics of pulse-coupled oscillators, whose phase response curves (PRC) are of the *delay-advance* type. Such PRC are used in synchronization of networked clocks [16], [17] and also arise in some models of natural oscillators [28], [31]. We prove that the oscillators get synchronized if the maximal distance between the initial phases is less than π and the interaction graph is static and has a directed spanning tree (such a graph is also called *quasi-strongly* connected), which is the *minimal* possible connectivity assumption. The same holds for *uniformly* quasi-strongly connected switching topology, whose consecutive switching points are separated by a dwell time, which is greater than the oscillators' period. Our results, confirmed by numerical simulations, extend the results from recent papers [17], [32], dealing with *strongly connected* topologies. Our results can be extended to even more general class of models, where the delay-advance PRC maps are *set-valued* and the jumping rule under k simultaneuous events is more general than (4) (see [30], [32] for a general framework, coming from hybrid systems theory [40]). The extensions of our results to more general classes of networks, including those with general PRC functions, *refraction periods* [17], [42] are the subject of ongoing research. In general phases of pulse-coupled oscillators do not synchronize and can for instance divide into several clusters [29]. Another important problem is to study the effect of couplings delays that can both facilitate the synchronization of PCOs [43], [44] and lead to its deterioration [45], [46].

References

[1] A. Proskurnikov and M. Cao, "Event-based synchronization in biology: Dynamics of pulse coupled oscillators," in *Proceedings of the First Intern. Conf. on Event-Based Control, Communication and Signal Processing (EBCCSP 2015)*, Krakow, 2015.

[2] R. Murray, *Control in an Information Rich World: Report of the Panel on Future Directions in Control, Dynamics and Systems*. Philadelphia, PA: SIAM, 2003.

[3] A. Matveev and A. Savkin, *Estimation and Control over Communication Networks*. Birkhäuser Boston, 2009.

[4] P. Tabuada, "Event-triggered real-time scheduling of stabilizing control tasks," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 52, no. 9, pp. 1680–1685, 2007.

[5] G. Seyboth, D. Dimarogonas, and K. Johansson, "Event-based broadcasting for multi-agent average consensus," *Automatica*, vol. 49, no. 1, pp. 245–252, 2013.

[6] C. D. Persis and P. Frasca, "Robust self-triggered coordination with ternary controllers," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 58, no. 12, pp. 3024–3038, 2013.

[7] M. Mazo and M. Cao, "Asynchronous decentralized event-triggered control," *Automatica*, vol. 50, no. 12, pp. 3197–3203, 2014.

[8] H. Smith, "Synchronous flashing of fireflies," *Science*, vol. 16, pp. 151–152, 1935.

[9] J. Buck, "Synchronous rhythmic flashing of fireflies," *The Quarterly Review of Biology*, vol. 13, no. 3, pp. 301–314, 1938.

[10] Z. Néda, E. Ravasz, Y. Brechet, T. Vicsek, and A.-L. Barabàsi, "Self-organizing processes: The sound of many hands clapping," *Nature*, vol. 403, pp. 849–850, 2000.

[11] C. Peskin, *Mathematical Aspects in Heart Physiology*. New York: Courant Inst. Math. Science, 1975.

[12] A. Winfree, *The Geometry of Biological Time*. Springer, 1980.

[13] ——, "Biological rhythms and the behavior of populations of coupled oscillators," *J. Theor. Biol.*, vol. 16, pp. 15–42, 1967.

[14] Y.-W. Hong and A. Scaglione, "A scalable synchronization protocol for large scale sensor networks and its applications," *IEEE J. on Selected Areas in Communication*, vol. 25, no. 5, pp. 1085–1099, 2005.

[15] R. Pagliari and A. Scaglione, "Scalable network synchronization with pulse-coupled oscillators," *IEEE Trans. Mobile Computing*, vol. 10, no. 3, pp. 392–405, 2011.

[16] Y. Wang and F. Doyle, "Optimal phase response functions for fast pulse-coupled synchronization in wireless sensor networks," *IEEE Trans. on Signal Proc.*, vol. 60, no. 10, pp. 5583–5588, 2012.

[17] Y. Wang, F. Núñez, and F. Doyle, "Energy-efficient pulse-coupled synchronization strategy design for wireless sensor networks through reduced idle listening," *IEEE Trans. on Signal Proc.*, vol. 60, no. 10, pp. 5293–5306, 2012.

[18] ——, "Increasing sync rate of pulse-coupled oscillators via phase response function design: Theory and application to wireless networks," *IEEE Trans. on Control Syst. Tech.*, vol. 21, no. 4, pp. 1455–1462, 2013.

[19] R. Mirollo and S. Strogatz, "Synchronization of pulse-coupled biological oscillators," *SIAM J. on Appl. Math.*, vol. 50, no. 6, pp. 1645–1662, 1990.

[20] Y. Kuramoto, "Collective synchronization of pulse-coupled oscillators and excitable units," *Physica D*, vol. 50, pp. 15–30, 1991.

[21] F. Dörfler and F. Bullo, "Synchronization in complex networks of phase oscillators: A survey," *Automatica*, vol. 50, no. 6, pp. 1539–1564, 2014.

[22] C. Canavier and S. Achuthan, "Pulse coupled oscillators and the phase resetting curve," *Mathematical Biosciences*, vol. 226, pp. 77–96, 2010.

[23] E. Izhikevich, "Weakly pulse-coupled oscillators, FM interactions, synchronization, and oscillatory associative memory," *IEEE Trans. on Neural Networks*, vol. 10, no. 3, pp. 508–526, 1999.

[24] A. Mauroy and R. Sepulchre, "Contraction of monotone phase-coupled oscillators," *Syst. Control Lett.*, vol. 61, no. 11, pp. 1097–1102, 2012.

[25] G. Schmidt, A. Papachristodoulou, U. Münz, and F. Allgöwer, "Frequency synchronization and phase agreement in Kuramoto oscillator networks with delays," *Automatica*, vol. 48, no. 12, pp. 3008–3017, 2012.

[26] L. Abbott and C. van Vreeswijk, "Asynchronous states in networks of pulse-coupled oscillators," *Phys. Review E*, vol. 48, no. 2, pp. 1483–1490, 1993.

[27] A. Mauroy and R. Sepulchre, "Global analysis of a continuum model for monotone pulse-coupled oscillators," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 58, no. 5, pp. 1154–1166, 2013.

[28] P. Goel and B. Ermentrout, "Synchrony, stability, and firing patterns in pulse-coupled oscillators," *Physica D*, vol. 163, pp. 191–216, 2002.

[29] L. Lücken and S. Yanchuk, "Two-cluster bifurcations in systems of globally pulse-coupled oscillators," *Physica D*, vol. 241, no. 4, pp. 350–359, 2012.

[30] F. Núñez, Y. Wang, and F. Doyle, "Global synchronization of pulse-coupled oscillators interacting on cycle graphs," *Automatica*, vol. 52, no. 2, pp. 202–209, 2015.

[31] E. Izhikevich, *Dynamical Systems in Neuroscience: The Geometry of Excitability and Bursting*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2007.

[32] F. Núñez, Y. Wang, and F. Doyle, "Synchronization of pulse-coupled oscillators on (strongly) connected graphs," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 60, no. 6, pp. 1710–1715, 2015.

[33] L. Moreau, "Stability of multiagent systems with time-dependent communication links," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 50, no. 2, pp. 169–182, 2005.

[34] A. Papachristodoulou, A. Jadbabaie, and U.Münz, "Effects of delay in multi-agent consensus and oscillator synchronization," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 55, no. 6, pp. 1471 – 1477, 2010.

[35] Z. Lin, B. Francis, and M. Maggiore, "State agreement for continuous-time coupled nonlinear systems," *SIAM Journ. of Control and Optimization*, vol. 46, no. 1, pp. 288–307, 2007.

[36] Y. Cao, W. Yu, W. Ren, and G. Chen, "An overview of recent progress in the study of distributed multi-agent coordination," *IEEE Trans. Ind. Inform.*, vol. 9, no. 1, pp. 427–438, 2013.

[37] E. Brown, J. Moehlis, and P. Holmes, "On the phase reduction and response dynamics of neural oscillator populations," *Neural Computation*, vol. 16, pp. 673–715, 2004.

[38] R. Dror, C. Canavier, R. Butera, J. Clark, and J. Byrne, "A mathematical criterion based on phase response curves for stability in a ring of coupled oscillators," *Biol. Cybern.*, vol. 80, pp. 11–23, 1999.

[39] R. Smeal, G. Ermentrout, and J. White, "Phase-response curves and synchronized neural networks," *Phil. Trans. Royal Soc. B*, vol. 365, pp. 2407–2422, 2010.

[40] R. Goebel, R. Sanfelice, and A. Teel, "Hybrid dynamical systems," *IEEE Contr. Syst. Mag.*, vol. 29, no. 2, pp. 28–93, 2009.

[41] N. Chopra and M.W.Spong, "On exponential synchronization of Kuramoto oscillators," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 54, no. 2, pp. 353–357, 2009.

[42] K. Konishi and H. Kokame, "Synchronization of pulse-coupled oscillators with a refractory period and frequency distribution for a wireless sensor network," *Chaos*, vol. 18, p. 033132, 2008.

[43] U. Ernst, K. Pawelzik, and T. Geisel, "Synchronization induced by temporal delays in pulse-coupled oscillators," *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, vol. 74, no. 9, pp. 1570–1573, 1995.

[44] ——, "Delay-induced multistable synchronization of biological oscillators," *Phys. Rev. E*, vol. 57, no. 2, pp. 2150–2162, 1998.

[45] W. Wu and T. Chen, "Desynchronization of pulse-coupled oscillators with delayed excitatory coupling," *Nonlinearity*, vol. 20, pp. 789–808, 2007.

[46] W. Wu, B. Liu, and T. Chen, "Analysis of firing behaviors in networks of pulse-coupled oscillators with delayed excitatory coupling," *Neural Networks*, vol. 23, pp. 783–788, 2010.


1
3
2
4
Events
4
3
2
1
5
10
15
20
25
30
35
t, sec